PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appellants:	Chidambaram Krishnan; James A. Hutchison, IV; Tom Summers	Confirmation No.	5659
Serial No.:	09/867,363		
Filed:	May 29, 2001	Customer No.:	23696
Examiner:	Aravind K. Moorthy		
Group Art Unit:	2131		
Docket No.:	010094		
Title:	POWER MANAGEMENT FOR SUBSCRIBER IDENTITY MODULE		

APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450,
Alexandria, VA 22313

Dear Sir:

This is an Appeal Brief responsive to the final Office Action mailed May 30, 2007, and Advisory Action mailed August 15, 2007. The Notice of Appeal was filed on August 20, 2007. Please charge Deposit Account No. 17-0026 the amount of $500.00 for submission of this Appeal Brief, as required by 37 C.F.R. §41.37(a)(2) for a large entity. Please charge any additional fees that may be required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is Qualcomm, Incorporated, of San Diego, California.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no related appeals or interferences.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-49, 52-57, 60-65 and 68-105 are on appeal in this case.

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 16-21, 23-25, 32-37, 39-41, 48, 74-78, 80-82, 89-94, 96-98 and 105 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Thakker (US 6,487,425)

Claims 6, 22, 38, 79 and 95 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thakker in view of Timonen (US 6,741,848).

Claims 10, 26, 42, 83 and 99 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thakker in view of Eber (US 6,595,414).

Claims 11-13, 27-29, 43-45, 84-86 and 100-102 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thakker in view of Barvesten (EP 0607767).

Claims 14, 15, 30, 31, 46, 47, 87, 88, 103 and 104 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thakker and Barvesten in view of Timonen.

Claims 49, 52, 53, 55-57, 60, 61, 63-65, 68, 69 and 71-73 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thakker in view of Barvesten.

Claims 54, 62 and 70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thakker and Barvesten in view of Timonen.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendments have been filed subsequent to the final Office Action mailed May 30, 2007, from which this Appeal has been made.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Independent claim 1 recites a method for managing power to a subscriber identity module (SIM) in a wireless communication device (WCD)[1] when power is supplied to the WCD during operation of the WCD[2]. The method comprises supplying power to the SIM when a request is pending for service by the SIM[3], supplying power to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM[4], and terminating power to the SIM when no request is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM[5].

Independent claim 17 recites a system for managing power to a SIM in a WCD when power is supplied to the WCD during operation of the WCD[6]. The system comprises a power source coupled to the SIM[7], and a processor[8] that controls the power source to supply power from the power source to the SIM when a request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM[9], supply power from the power source to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM[10], and terminate power to the SIM when no request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM[11].

Independent claim 33 recites a computer-readable medium containing instructions[12] that cause a programmable processor to manage power to a SIM of a WCD when power is supplied to the WCD during operation of the WCD[13]. The instructions cause the programmable processor to supply power to the SIM when a request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM[14], supply power to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of

---

[1] See paragraph [0008].
[2] See paragraphs [0008] and [0009].
[3] See paragraphs [0039] and [0040].
[4] See paragraphs [0039] and [0040].
[5] See paragraph [0041].
[6] See paragraphs [0008], [0009] and [0011].
[7] See paragraph [0036].
[8] See paragraph [0032].
[9] See paragraphs [0039] and [0040].
[10] See paragraphs [0039] and [0040].
[11] See paragraph [0041].
[12] See paragraphs [0055]-[0057].
[13] See paragraphs [0008] and [0009].
[14] See paragraphs [0039] and [0040].

power to the SIM[15], and terminate power to the SIM when no request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM[16].

Independent claim 49 recites a method comprising storing a user access code associated with a SIM in a memory associated with a WCD in response to a user entering the access code at an initial power up of the WCD[17], retrieving the user access code from the memory when power is resupplied to the SIM[18], using the retrieved user access code in a security authorization process in the WCD to authorize use of secure features of the SIM[19], terminating power to the SIM when no request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM[20], terminating power to the SIM when power to the WCD is terminated[21], retrieving and using the user access code when power is resupplied to the SIM following termination of power to the SIM when no request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM[22], and accepting and using user input as the user access code when power is resupplied to the SIM following termination when power to the WCD is terminated[23].

Independent claim 57 recites a system comprising a memory that stores a user access code associated with a SIM in a memory associated with a WCD in response to a user entering the access code at an initial power up of the WCD[24], and a processor[25] that retrieves the user access code from the memory when power is resupplied to the SIM[26], uses the retrieved user access code in a security authorization process in the WCD to authorize use of the WCD[27], terminates power to the SIM when no request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM[28], terminates

---

[15] See paragraphs [0039] and [0040].
[16] See paragraph [0041].
[17] See paragraphs [0050]-[0052].
[18] See paragraph [0052].
[19] See paragraph [0052]; see also paragraphs [0027] and [0030].
[20] See paragraphs [0039] and [0040].
[21] See paragraph [0050].
[22] See paragraphs [0051] and [0052]; see also paragraph [0041].
[23] See paragraph [0050].
[24] See paragraphs [0050] and [0051].
[25] See paragraph [0032].
[26] See paragraph [0052].
[27] See paragraph [0052]; see also paragraphs [0027] and [0030].
[28] See paragraphs [0039] and [0040].

power to the SIM when power to the WCD is terminated[29], retrieves and uses the user access code when power is resupplied to the SIM following termination of power to the SIM when no request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM[30], and accepts and uses user input as the user access code when power is resupplied to the SIM following termination of power to the SIM when power to the WCD is terminated[31].

Independent claim 65 recites a computer-readable medium containing instructions[32] that cause a processor to store a user access code associated with a SIM in a memory associated with a WCD in response to a user entering the access code at an initial power up of the WCD[33], retrieve the user access code from the memory when power is resupplied to the SIM[34], use the retrieved user access code in a security authorization process in the WCD to authorize use of the WCD[35], terminate power to the SIM when no request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM[36], terminate power to the SIM when power to the WCD is terminated[37], retrieve and use the user access code when power is resupplied to the SIM following termination of power to the SIM when no request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM[38], and accept and use user input as the user access code when power is resupplied to the SIM following termination of power to the SIM when power to the WCD is terminated[39].

Independent claim 74 recites a WCD capable of receiving a SIM[40], wherein the WCD manages power to the SIM when power is supplied to the WCD during operation of the WCD[41], the WCD comprising means for supplying power to the SIM when a request is pending for

---

[29] See paragraph [0050].
[30] See paragraphs [0051] and [0052]; see also paragraph [0041].
[31] See paragraph [0050].
[32] See paragraphs [0055]-[0057].
[33] See paragraphs [0050] and [0051].
[34] See paragraph [0052].
[35] See paragraph [0052]; see also paragraphs [0027] and [0030].
[36] See paragraphs [0039] and [0040].
[37] See paragraph [0050].
[38] See paragraphs [0051] and [0052]; see also paragraph [0041].
[39] See paragraph [0050].q
[40] See paragraphs [0008] and [0005].
[41] See paragraphs [0008] and [0009].

service by the SIM[42], means for supplying power to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM[43], and means for terminating power to the SIM when no request is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM[44].

Independent claim 90 recites a WCD capable of receiving a SIM[45], wherein the WCD manages power to the SIM when power is supplied to the WCD during operation of the WCD[46], the WCD comprising a power source capable of being coupled to the SIM[47] and a processor[48] that controls the power source to supply power from the power source to the SIM when a request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM[49], supply power from the power source to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM[50], and terminate power to the SIM when no request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM[51].

GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Appellants submit the following grounds of rejection to be reviewed on Appeal:

(1) The first ground of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is the rejection of claims 1-5, 7-9, 16-21, 23-25, 32-37, 39-41, 48, 74-78, 80-82, 89-94, 96-98 and 105 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Thakker (US 6,487,425)

(2) The second ground of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is the rejection of claims 6, 22, 38, 79 and 95 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thakker in view of Timonen (US 6,741,848).

---

[42] See paragraphs [0039] and [0040]. See also, modem 14 of FIGS. 1-4.
[43] See paragraphs [0039] and [0040]. See also, modem 14 of FIGS. 1-4.
[44] See paragraph [0041]. See also, modem 14 of FIGS. 1-4.
[45] See paragraphs [0008] and [0005].
[46] See paragraphs [0008] and [0009].
[47] See paragraph [0037].
[48] See paragraph [0032].
[49] See paragraphs [0039] and [0040].
[50] See paragraphs [0039] and [0040].
[51] See paragraph [0041].

(3) The third ground of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is the rejection of claims 10, 26, 42, 83 and 99 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thakker in view of Eber (US 6,595,414).

(4) The fourth ground of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is the rejection of claims 11-13, 27-29, 43-45, 84-86 and 100-102 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thakker in view of Barvesten (EP 0607767).

(5) The fifth ground of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is the rejection of claims 14, 15, 30, 31, 46, 47, 87, 88, 103 and 104 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thakker and Barvesten in view of Timonen.

(6) The sixth ground of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is the rejection of claims 49, 52, 53, 55-57, 60, 61, 63-65, 68, 69 and 71-73 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thakker in view of Barvesten.

(7) The seventh ground of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is the rejection of claims 54, 62 and 70 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thakker and Barvesten in view of Timonen.

ARGUMENT

Appellants respectfully traverse the current rejections advanced in the final Office Action, and requests reversal by the Board of Patent Appeals based on the arguments below. Appellants respectfully request separate review of each set of claims argued under separate headings.

FIRST GROUND OF REJECTION UNDER APPEAL

(Claims 1-5, 7-9, 16-21, 23-25, 32-37, 39-41, 48, 74-78, 80-82, 89-94, 96-98 and 105)

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 16-21, 23-25, 32-37, 39-41, 48, 74-78, 80-82, 89-94, 96-98 and 105 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Thakker (US 6,487,425).

In order to support an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), it is well established that a prior art reference must disclose each and every element of a claim. This well known rule of law is commonly referred to as the "all-elements rule."[52] If a prior art reference fails to disclose any element of a claim, then rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is improper.[53]

Thakker fails to disclose not one, but many features that are recited in claims 1-5, 7-9, 16-21, 23-25, 32-37, 39-41, 48, 74-78, 80-82, 89-94, 96-98 and 105. Therefore, the rejections of claims 1-5, 7-9, 16-21, 23-25, 32-37, 39-41, 48, 74-78, 80-82, 89-94, 96-98 and 105 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are improper and must be reversed.

Independent claim 1 recites a method for managing power to a subscriber identity module (SIM) in a wireless communication device (WCD) when power is supplied to the WCD during operation of the WCD. The method comprises supplying power to the SIM when a request is pending for service by the SIM, supplying power to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM, and terminating power to the SIM when no request is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM.

Independent claims 17, 33, 74 and 90 recite features that are similar to those of independent claim 1.

---

[52] *See Hybritech Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 231 USPQ 81 (CAFC 1986) ("it is axiomatic that for prior art to anticipate under 102 it has to meet every element of the claimed invention").
[53] *Id. See also Lewmar Marine, Inc. v. Barient, Inc.* 827 F.2d 744, 3 USPQ2d 1766 (CAFC 1987); *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (CAFC 1990); *C.R. Bard, Inc. v. MP Systems, Inc.*, 157 F.3d 1340, 48 USPQ2d 1225

With respect to the features recited in Appellants' independent claims 1, 17, 33, 74 and 90, the final Office Action misinterpreted Thakker. Thakker does not disclose or suggest the features that the final Office Action attributes to this reference. Each passage of Thakker, which was cited in the final Office Action in support of the rejections of Appellants' independent claims 1, 17, 33, 74 and 90, is analyzed below.

In the rejections of independent claims 1, 17, 33, 74 and 90, the final Office Action indicated that Thakker discloses a method for managing power to a SIM in a WCD. The final Office Action failed to cite to any passage of Thakker in support of this conclusion. Moreover, the Advisory Action cited purported passages of Thakker that do not even exist.[54] The conclusion in the final Office Action that Thakker discloses a method for managing power to a SIM in a WCD is incorrect.

Thakker does not, in fact, disclose any techniques for managing power to a SIM in a WCD when power is supplied to the WCD during operation of the WCD. Like many of the previously cited references (which the Examiner withdrew from previous rejections), the Thakker reference is concerned with power management of the WCD, and not power management of a SIM within the WCD. While Thakker mentions the use of a SIM, and discusses power management to a WCD, this reference lacks any teaching or suggestion of any method or technique for controlling power to a SIM in a WCD.

Thakker generally teaches a method of supporting a switch from a limited operations low power operating mode of a mobile station to a normal operating mode of the mobile station.[55] Nothing in the disclosure of Thakker even discusses whether power is supplied to a SIM (or disabled) in these different modes.

Thakker teaches a technique in which a mobile station informs the network that it is entering into a low power operating mode, and the network acknowledges that the mobile station

---

(CAFC 1998); *Oney v. Ratliff*, 182 F.3d 893, 51 USPQ2d 1697 (CAFC 1999); *Apple Computer, Inc. v. Articulate Systems, Inc.*, 234 F.3d 14, 57 USPQ2d 1057 (CAFC 2000).

[54] Appellants noted similar discrepancies in responding to the final Office Action. Both the final Office Action and the Advisory Action stated that "Thakker discloses SIM 16 may include a CPU 26 or other control logic and memory 28…" In the Thakker reference, however, element 16 is a network subsystem, element 26 is a base station or base transceiver station (BTS) and element 28 is a controller. The final Office Action and Advisory Action also identified many other elements such as UART circuit 24, clock input (SIM_CLK), and reset input (SIM_RST) that are not disclosed in the Thakker reference. The comments and conclusions in the final Office Action with regard to the anticipation rejections based on Thakker are clearly improper insofar as they rely on teachings and passages that are not even within the Thakker reference.

[55] See Abstract of Thakker.

is in the low power operating mode.[56] Calls can be made to a number associated with the low power operating mode, but such calls to the number associated with the lower power operating mode cause the mobile station to switch to the normal operating mode. Again, nothing in Thakker even discusses whether or not power is supplied to a SIM in the different modes, much less teaches the specific features of Appellants' claims that require the supply of power or the termination of power to a SIM based on whether a request is pending for service by the SIM or the device requests maintenance of power to the SIM.

The final Office Action indicated that Thakker discloses the following:

> supplying power to the SIM [citing column 5, lines 28-37 of Thakker] when a request is pending for service by the SIM [citing column 6, lines 28-49 of Thakker];
> supplying power to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM [citing column 6, lines 28-49 of Thakker]; and
> terminating power to the SIM when no request is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM [citing column 7, lines 42-64 of Thakker].

Each of these different passages of Thakker, which were cited in the Office Action in support of the rejections of Appellants' independent claims, is reproduced below.

The passage of Thakker at column 5, lines 28-37 states:

> The MS 12 usually includes a mobile transceiver and a Subscriber Identity Module (SIM). The SIM may include an identity indicator (a "secret" key for authentication), and other relevant network/user information. The mobile transceiver itself is uniquely identified by the International Mobile Equipment identify (IMEI-typically, a telephone number). The identification features of the MS 12 are independent, thereby allowing mobility of the subscriber about the service area of the GSM network 11.

This passage appears to be the only passage of Thakker that even mentions a SIM. Contrary to the analysis of the Office Action, nothing in this passage or any passage of Thakker discloses or suggests any type of method for controlling power to a SIM, much less the specific features of Appellants' claims that require the supply of power or the termination of power to a SIM based on whether a request is pending for service by the SIM or the device requests maintenance of power to the SIM.

The passage of Thakker at column 6, lines 28-49 states:

> The telecommunication system 60 is seen to include a PLMN or GSM network 40 adapted to communicate with the MS 50 and to cause it to switch from a limited

[56] See Abstract of Thakker.

> operations low power mode to a normal operating mode when a call placed to an MSISDN number associated with the limited operations low power mode is detected. The GSM network 40 uses standard wireless signaling protocols between the MS 50 and the MSC 42 to detect, for instance, if the subscriber has placed the MS 50 in the limited operations low power mode and to transmit A-interface messages to the MS 50 which carry the POP message. The POP message is received by the MS 50 and used to switch to a normal operating mode of the MS 50.
>
> As such, the MSC 42 is configured to provide a new A-interface message 44 that instructs the MS 50 to switch from the limited operations low power mode to a normal operating mode. The A-interface message provides direct communications between the MS 50 and the MSC 42 or between the MSC 42 and the BSC 46. This provides a mechanism within the network PLMN for direct interface between different elements in the GSM network 40.

This passage lacks any teaching that suggests the features of Appellants' claims, and does not disclose the features that the Office Action attributed to this passage. In particular, the passage at column 6, lines 28-49, lacks any suggestion of supplying power to the SIM when a request is pending for service by the SIM and supplying power to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM.

The passage of Thakker at column 6, lines 28-49 teaches a "limited operations mode" of the WCD, but lacks any discussion of whether or not power is supplied or terminated to the SIM within the WCD. In fact, the teaching at column 6, lines 28-49, does not discuss any specifics of the "limited operations mode," but concerns the manner in which a network can instruct the mobile station to switch from the limited operations low power mode to a normal operating mode.

Furthermore, the passage of Thakker at column 6, lines 28-49 specifically indicates that the "subscriber" (i.e., the user) places the mobile station in the limited operations mode. This teaching of Thakker contrasts the features of Appellants' claims, which do not necessarily require any physical action by a subscriber. Instead, Appellants' claims require supplying power to the SIM when a request is pending for service by the SIM and supplying power to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM, and such features may operate independent of any action by the subscriber. The user placing a mobile station in limited operations mode (per Thakker) is not suggestive of a technique that requires supplying power to the SIM when a request is pending for service by the SIM,

supplying power to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM, and terminating power to the SIM when no request is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM.

The passage of Thakker at column 7, lines 42-64 states:

> Once the GSM network 40 has sent a POP mode acknowledgment message (at signal sequence 94) to the MS 50, the MS 50 will remain in the limited operations low power mode, listening only for POP messages from the GSM network 40. While in POP mode, the MS 50 operates using minimal power where, for example, only critical operations are maintained and the display is blank and no outgoing calls are made unless POP mode is disabled, using the POP OFF button 74, for example.
>
> Regardless of the amount of power utilized by the MS 50 during limited operations low power, the MS 50 continues to perform a few critical functions. For example, the MS 50 is responsible to inform the network 40 of its location as illustrated by the location update request signal sequence 96. Thus, the MS 50 powers up periodically in order to ascertain its location and update the network 40. This positioning is performed by allowing the MS 50 to send a LOCATION UPDATE REQUEST message to the GSM network 40. The GSM network 40, in turn, sends a LOCATION UPDATING ACCEPT message at signal sequence 98, to the MS 50. By continuously updating the location of the MS 50 in the GSM network 40, a subscriber may be reached, even while the MS 50 is in POP mode.

Nothing in this passage of Thakker at column 7, lines 42-64 discloses the features attributed to it by the Office Action. In particular, contrary to the statements in the final Office Action, the passage of Thakker at column 7, lines 42-64, does not disclose terminating power to the SIM when no request is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM. These features are simply not discussed in the passage reproduced above. Appellants are generally perplexed by the assertion in the final Office Action that these features are taught in the passage copied above. On the contrary, this passage of Thakker describes location updates and POP messaging, neither of which bears any relevance to the requirements of the claims.

In short, contrary to the analysis in the final Office Action, Thakker fails to suggest supplying power to the SIM when a request is pending for service by the SIM, supplying power to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM, and terminating power to the SIM when no request is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM as required

by independent claims 1, 17, 33, 49, 57 and 65. While the Office Action cites several passages of Thakker in support of the rejections, these passages (reproduced above) are deficient, if not wholly irrelevant, with respect to the features of Appellants' independent claims.

Moreover, the pending claims require managing power to a SIM in a WCD when power is supplied to the WCD during operation of the WCD. These features also distinguish Thakker insofar as Thakker merely teaches low power modes for the WCD, and does not have any discussion, whatsoever, of power management to a SIM within a WCD.

The cited passages of Thakker appear to teach nothing more than the fact that SIMs were known, and that basic power management techniques for a WCD were known. The power management techniques discussed in Thakker lack any teaching with respect to the supply or termination of power specifically to a SIM within a WCD, much less the supply or termination of power to a SIM based on the specific contingencies of Appellants' claims.

The "Response to Arguments" section of the final Office Action stated that "Applicant argues that Thacker does not disclose any techniques for controlling power to a SIM in a WCD." This generalized statement seems to misunderstand Appellants' fundamental point on this issue. In particular, Appellants have more specifically explained that, like many of the previously cited references of the numerous non-final Office Actions to date (which the Examiner withdrew from previous rejections), the Thakker reference is merely concerned with power management of the WCD and not the specific power management of a SIM within the WCD when power is supplied to the WCD.

While Thakker mentions the use of a SIM, and discusses power management to a WCD, this reference lacks any teaching or suggestion of any method or technique for controlling power to a SIM in a WCD when power is supplied to the WCD. Power management of a SIM and power management of a WCD are two entirely different concepts, which the Office Action seems to have overlooked, notwithstanding an apparent recognition of this distinction in previous prosecution of this application.

A WCD, for example, may operate in a low power mode that does not terminate power to the SIM. The Thakker reference fails to even address whether or not power is supplied to the SIM in its so-called limited operations low power operating mode, and fails to suggest any power termination to the SIM based on the contingencies of Appellants' claims.

Again, Thakker generally teaches a method of supporting a switch from a limited operations low power operating mode of a mobile station to a normal operating mode of the mobile station.[57] Nothing in Thakker even discusses whether power is supplied to a SIM (or disabled) in these different modes. For example, the final Office Action identified nothing in Thakker that suggests that power is even disabled to the SIM in the low power mode of Thakker, much less a teaching that suggests the termination of power to the SIM when no request is pending and no software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM, as required by Appellants' claims.

In responding to Appellants' arguments, the final Office Action and Advisory Action made a number of citations to Thakker that do not even exist. For example, the final Office Action and Advisory Action stated that "Thakker discloses SIM 16 may include a CPU 26 or other control logic and memory 28…" In the Thakker reference, however, element 16 is a network subsystem, element 26 is a base station or base transceiver station (BTS) and element 28 is a controller. The final Office Action and Advisory Action both seem to be citing passages of an unidentified reference and attributing the teaching of this unidentified reference to Thakker.

The final Office Action and Advisory Action also identified many other elements such as UART circuit 24, clock input (SIM_CLK), and reset input (SIM_RST) that are not disclosed in the Thakker reference.[58] The comments and conclusions in the final Office Action with regard to the anticipation rejections based on Thakker are clearly improper insofar as they rely on teachings and passages that are not even within the Thakker reference.

The final Office Action also concluded that Thakker discloses supplying power to the SIM when a request is pending for service by the SIM, supplying power to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM, and terminating power to the SIM when no request is pending and no software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM. This is simply wrong. Thakker does not disclose or suggest any technique that supplies or terminates power to a SIM based on whether a request is pending for service by the SIM or a software module running on the WCD requests

[57] See Abstract of Thakker.
[58] Appellants informed the Examiner of these discrepancies in responding to the final Office Action, but the Examiner cited the same erroneous passages in the Advisory Action.

maintenance of power to the SIM. Thakker does not even mention any determination relating to these inquiries.

For these features, the final Office Action relied upon vague passages of Thakker that disclose a limited operations mode for a WCD. Such passages, however, lack any detail regarding this so-called limited operations mode, and fail to identify the supply or termination of power to the SIM as being any part of such mode. Again, the claims specifically require the supply or termination of power to the SIM (while power is supplied to the WCD) based on whether a request is pending for service by the SIM or a software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM. Thakker does not disclose these features, and the final Office Action is erroneous in relying on vague, inapplicable passages of Thakker that discuss a limited operations low power mode for a WCD to support the rejections.

In addition, contrary to the statements in the final Office Action, Thakker does not disclose terminating power to the SIM when no request is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM. In particular, contrary to the statements in the final Office Action, these features are not discussed in the passage at column 7, lines 42-64. The passage of Thakker column 7, lines 42-64 mentions the "limited operations mode" but actually describes location updates and POP messaging, neither of which bears any relevance to the requirements of the claims. Furthermore, the vague mention of the limited operations mode in Thakker fails to provide any detail regarding whether or not power is supplied to the SIM in this mode. Nothing in Thakker suggest supplying or terminating power to the SIM (when power is supplied to the WCD during operation of the WCD) based on whether a request is pending for service by the SIM or a software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM.

In summary, contrary to the analysis in the final Office Action, Thakker fails to suggest supplying power to the SIM when a request is pending for service by the SIM, supplying power to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM, and terminating power to the SIM when no request is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM as required by independent claims 1, 17, 33, 74 and 90. While the final Office Action cites several passages of Thakker in support of the rejections, these passages are deficient, if not wholly irrelevant, with

respect to the features of Appellants' independent claims.[59] A mere mention of a "limited operations mode" per Thakker is not suggestive of a technique for managing power to a SIM when power is supplied to the WCD, much less a technique that requires the supply or termination of power to the SIM based on whether a request is pending for service by the SIM or a software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM, as required by Appellants' claims.

Moreover, the pending claims specifically require managing power to a SIM in a WCD when power is supplied to the WCD during operation of the WCD. These features also distinguish Thakker insofar as Thakker merely teaches low power modes for the WCD, and does not have any discussion, whatsoever, of power management specifically for the SIM when power is supplied to the WCD during operation of the WCD.

The cited passages of Thakker appear to teach nothing more than the fact that SIMs were known, and that power management techniques for a WCD were known. The power management techniques discussed in Thakker lack any teaching with respect to the supply or termination of power specifically to a SIM, much less the supply or termination of power to a SIM based on the specific contingencies of Appellants' claims.

For at least the reasons outlined above, the final Office Action is clearly deficient, and fails to establish a prima facie case of anticipation with respect to independent claims 1, 17, 33, 74 and 90.

(Claims 2, 18, 34, 75 and 91)

Claims 2, 18, 34, 75 and 91 are patentable by virtue of the dependency upon claims 1, 17, 33, 74 and 90 respectively. In addition, claims 2, 18, 34, 75 and 91 are patentable for another reason. Therefore, Appellants have presented claims 2, 18, 34, 75 and 91 under a separate heading.

Claim 2 recites re-initiating supply of power to the SIM following termination of power to the SIM when a request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM. Claims 18, 34, 75 and 91 recite similar features.

The final Office Action cited the same passage of Thakker at column 6, lines 28-49, which is reproduced above, in support of the rejections of claims 2, 18, 34, 75.

[59] As noted above, some of the cited passages do not even appear to exist.

Appellants respectfully submit that the cited passage of Thakker at column 6, lines 28-49 fails to disclose or suggest the features of claims 2, 18, 34, 75 and 91. While this passage may disclose a message to instruct a mobile station to switch from a limited operations low power mode to a normal mode, nothing in Thakker even describes whether or not a SIM within a WCD receives power in the limited operations low power mode. Accordingly, it remains entirely unclear whether the system of Thakker re-initiates supply of power to the SIM following termination of power to the SIM.

For this additional reason, the rejections claims 2, 18, 34, 75 and 91 should be reversed.

(Claims 3, 19, 35, 76 and 92)

Claims 3, 19, 35, 76 and 92 are patentable by virtue of the dependency upon claims 1, 17, 33, 74 and 90 respectively. In addition, claims 3, 19, 35, 76 and 92 are patentable for another reason. Therefore, Appellants have presented claims 3, 19, 35, 76 and 92 under a separate heading.

Claim 3 recites determining whether a request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM based on inspection of a request queue associated with the SIM. Claims 19, 35, 76 and 92 recite similar features.

The final Office Action cited the following passage of Thakker at column 8, lines 47-62 in support of the rejections of claims 3, 19, 35, 76 and 92:

> With reference to FIG. **8**, therein is shown a process flow diagram for a method of enabling the POP feature of the present invention. The method, denoted generally as **130**, begins when a second MSISDN number is assigned to an MS **50** within the network **40** (step **132**). Next, the subscriber places the MS **50** in POP mode by, for example, depressing the POP ON button **66** (step **134**). During the period when an incoming call is not made to the MS **50**, the MS **50** performs periodic locations updates (step **136**). Once an incoming call is detected (step **138**), the MSC **42** determines whether it is placed to the MSISDN number **1** or MSISDN number **2** (step **140**). If the incoming call is placed to the first MSISDN, then the process flow is directed to step **142** wherein the call si switched to a subscriber voice mail system (step **146**), if any, or an announcement indicating the subscriber cannot be reached (step **144**).

Nothing in this passage even remotely suggests any inspection of a request queue, much less determining whether a request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM based on inspection of a request queue associated with the SIM, as required by claims 3, 19, 35, 76 and 92. It is unclear why the final Office Action relied upon this passage. For this addition reason, the rejections of claims 3, 19, 35, 76 and 92 should be reversed.

(Claims 4, 20, 37, 77 and 93)

Claims 4, 20, 37, 77 and 93 are patentable by virtue of the dependency upon claims 1, 17, 33, 74 and 90 respectively. In addition, claims 4, 20, 37, 77 and 93 are patentable for another reason. Therefore, Appellants have presented claims 4, 20, 37, 77 and 93 under a separate heading.

Claim 4 recites re-initiating supply of power to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM. Claims 20, 37, 77 and 93 recite similar features.

The final Office Action cited the passage of Thakker at column 6, lines 28-49 (reproduced above) in support of the rejections of claims 4, 20, 37, 77 and 93. However, the passage of Thakker at column 6, lines 28-49 fails to suggest re-initiating supply of power to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM. Again, in Thakker, it is not even clear whether power is ever disabled to the SIM. Furthermore, column 6, lines 28-49, of Thakker fails to suggest anything that specifically happens when a software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM.

For these addition reasons, the rejections of claims 4, 20, 37, 77 and 93 should be reversed.

(Claims 5, 21, 38, 78 and 94)

Claims 5, 21, 38, 78 and 94 are patentable by virtue of the dependency upon claims 1, 17, 33, 74 and 90 respectively, and upon claims 4, 20, 37, 77 and 93 respectively. In addition, claims 5, 21, 38, 78 and 94 are patentable for another reason. Therefore, Appellants have presented claims 5, 21, 38, 78 and 94 under a separate heading.

Claim 5 recites determining whether a software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM based on polling of any of a plurality of software modules running on the WCD. Claims 21, 38, 78 and 94 recite similar features.

The final Office Action cited the passage of Thakker at column 8, lines 47-62 (reproduced above) in support of the rejections of claims 5, 21, 38, 78 and 94. However, the passage of Thakker at column 8, lines 47-62 fails to suggest determining whether a software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM based on polling of any of a plurality of software modules running on the WCD. Indeed, nothing in column 8, lines 47-62 even remotely suggests the features of claims 5, 21, 38, 78 and 94.

For this additional reason, the rejections of claims 5, 21, 38, 78 and 94 should be reversed.

(Claims 8, 24, 40, 81 and 97)

Claims 8, 24, 40, 81 and 97 are patentable by virtue of the dependency upon claims 1, 17, 33, 74 and 90 respectively. In addition, claims 8, 24, 40, 81 and 97 are patentable for another reason. Therefore, Appellants have presented claims 8, 24, 40, 81 and 97 under a separate heading.

Claim 8 recites that the SIM includes an interface circuit that interfaces with the WCD, and terminating power to the SIM includes terminating power to the interface circuit. Claims 24, 40, 81 and 97 recite similar features.

The final Office Action cited the passage of Thakker at column 7, lines 42-64 (reproduced above), in support of the rejections of claims 8, 24, 40, 81 and 97.

The passage of Thakker at column 7, lines 42-64 fails to disclose or suggest a SIM that includes an interface circuit that interfaces with the WCD, wherein terminating power to the SIM includes terminating power to the interface circuit, as required by claims 8, 24, 40, 81 and 97. Indeed, the passage of Thakker at column 7, lines 42-64 does not even discuss a SIM, much less a SIM that includes an interface circuit that wherein terminating power to the SIM includes terminating power to the interface circuit.

For these addition reasons, the rejections of claims 8, 24, 40, 81 and 97 should be reversed.

(Claims 9, 25, 41, 82 and 98)

Claims 9, 25, 41, 82 and 98 are patentable by virtue of the dependency upon claims 1, 17, 33, 74 and 90 respectively. In addition, claims 9, 25, 41, 82 and 98 are patentable for another reason. Therefore, Appellants have presented claims 9, 25, 41, 82 and 98 under a separate heading.

Claim 9 recites that the SIM includes a power supply line coupled to the WCD, and terminating power to the SIM includes terminating power to the power supply line.

The final Office Action cited the same passage of Thakker at column 7, lines 42-64 (reproduced above) in support of the rejections of claims 9, 25, 41, 82 and 98. However, the passage of Thakker at column 7, lines 42-64 fails to disclose or suggest a SIM that includes a power supply line coupled to the WCD, wherein terminating power to the SIM includes terminating power to the power supply line.

Again, the passage of Thakker at column 7, lines 42-64 does not even discuss a SIM, much less a SIM that includes a power supply line coupled to the WCD, wherein terminating power to the SIM includes terminating power to the power supply line. Furthermore, the final Office Action's interpretation of the passage of Thakker at column 7, lines 42-64 is different and inconsistent for the analysis of claims 8, 24, 40, 81 and 97 and the analysis of claims 9, 25, 41, 82 and 98.

For these addition reasons, the rejections of claims 9, 25, 41, 82 and 98 should be reversed.

SECOND GROUND OF REJECTION UNDER APPEAL

(Claims 6, 22, 38, 79 and 95)

Claims 6, 22, 38, 79 and 95 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thakker in view of Timonen (US 6,741,848).

The Supreme Court recently clarified the standard of non-obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*[60] In *KSR*, the Supreme Court explained that, the Examiner must identify a logical reason why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been led to make a modification or combination to arrive at the claimed invention. An invention

[60] *See KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. ____ (case 04-1350) (April 30, 2007).

composed of several elements is not proved obvious merely by demonstrating that each of the elements was independently known.[61]

Consistent with *KSR*, the Federal Circuit has stated that there must be "some rationale, articulation, or reasoned basis" to support the legal conclusion of obviousness."[62] The reason for modification need not conform to the particular motivation or objective of the patent applicant.[63] However, there still must be some need or problem known in the art that would have provided a reason for combining elements in the manner claimed.[64]

Furthermore, a basic premise of the obviousness analysis set forth in *KSR* is that the combination of prior art references must actually disclose the elements recited in the claims. For Consistent with this premise, the Manual for Patenting Examining Procedure (MPEP) sets forth three basic requirements to an obviousness analysis as follows.[65] First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.[66]

The *KSR* case clarified that the "suggestion or motivation" requirement is more broadly a requirement that the Examiner articulate a "rational reason" for the modification. However, the *KSR* case did not modify the basic requirement of the obviousness analysis that requires the Examiner to show that the prior art collectively teaches the elements of Appellant's claims. Accordingly, if Appellants can show that the prior art lacks a teaching of one or more elements of the pending claims, the obviousness rejections must be reversed. In addition, if Appellants can show that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have had any *rational* reason to arrive at the claimed invention in view of the prior art, the obviousness rejections must be reversed.

Claims 6, 22, 38, 79 and 95 are dependent upon claims 1, 17, 33, 74 and 90 respectively, and upon claims 4, 20, 36, 77 and 93 respectively. Claim 6 recites asserting respective bits in a

---

[61] *KSR*, Slip op. at 14.
[62] *Alza Corp. v. Mylan Laboratories*, 80 USPQ2d 1001, 1005 (Fed. Cir. 2006) (citing *In re Kahn*, 78 USPQ2d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2006)).
[63] *KSR*, Slip op. at 16.
[64] *Id*.
[65] See MPEP 2143.
[66] See MPEP 2143.

data structure when corresponding software modules running on the WCD request supply of power to the SIM, determining whether a software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM based on analysis of the data structure, and when any of the bits in the data structure is asserted, supplying power to the SIM. Claims 22, 38, 79 and 95 recite similar features.

Claims 6, 22, 38, 79 and 95 are patentable by virtue of the dependency upon claims 1, 17, 33, 74 and 90. As addressed above, the primary Thakker reference fails to disclose or suggest the features of independent claims 1, 17, 33, 74 and 90. In addition, claims 6, 22, 38, 79 and 95 are patentable for additional reasons.

The final Office Action recognized that Thakker fails to suggest the features of claims 6, 22, 38, 79 and 95. However, the final Office Action cited column 3, lines 3-32 of Timonen as disclosing such features. The final Office Action then concluded that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have modified the system of Thakker in view of the teaching of Timonen to arrive at the features of claims 6, 22, 38, 79 and 95.

Appellants disagree. The passage of Timonen at column 3, lines 3-32 is reproduced below:

> station users may want to use them for paying for mobile communication services as well.
>
> The patent application WO 9834430 describes a method of allocating a temporary username from a wireless telecommunication network. In said publication, a mobile communication service is described, which is used without a previously made agreement and without a SIM card. According to the central idea of the publication, a mobile communication network can thus be contacted anonymously, and the network gives a temporary username for the duration of the call. By means of this identifier, the service offered for a specific mobile station is distinguished from the services of other mobile stations. This makes the use of mobile communication services more flexible and provides the user with more alternatives. The method described in the publication may well be used in free mobile communication services and also in the method of payment on a smart card, on which the mobile communication operator can rely.
>
> A problem in the above arrangement is that it is not possible for the network operator to identify a user without identification means, such as a SIM card, and the payer of the bill, for example, cannot thus be guaranteed. The network operator has no guarantee of obtaining a compensation for the use of the telecommunication connection, unless some other reliable credit card is simultaneously charged. If the user remains unidentified, there is a growing risk of potential criminal actions, since the only identifier that is required is a mobile station identifier. According to the prior art, it is not possible to contact a visited mobile communication network, with which the home network does not have a roaming agreement.

Appellants are entirely perplexed by the assertion in the final Office Action that this passage of Timonen suggests the features of claims 6, 22, 38, 79 and 95. Again, exemplary claim 6 recites asserting respective bits in a data structure when corresponding software modules running on the WCD request supply of power to the SIM, determining whether a software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM based on analysis of the data structure, and when any of the bits in the data structure is asserted, supplying power to the SIM. None of these features are suggested by the passage above.

For this additional reason, the rejections of claims 6, 22, 38, 79 and 95 must be reversed.

THIRD GROUND OF REJECTION UNDER APPEAL

(Claims 10, 26, 42, 83 and 99)

Claims 10, 26, 42, 83 and 99 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thakker in view of Eber (US 6,595,414).

Claims 10, 26, 42, 83 and 99 are dependent upon claims 1, 17, 33, 74 and 90 respectively, and are patentable by virtue of the dependency upon claims 1, 17, 33, 74 and 90. As addressed above, the primary Thakker reference fails to disclose or suggest the features of independent claims 1, 17, 33, 74 and 90. In addition, claims 10, 26, 42, 83 and 99 are patentable for additional reasons.

Claim 10 recites that the SIM includes an interface circuit that interfaces with the WCD, the interface circuit including a clock input to the SIM , and wherein terminating power to the SIM includes terminating power after terminating a clock signal to the clock input. Claims 17, 33, 74 and 90 recite similar features.

The Office Action recognized that Thakker fails to suggest the features of claims 10, 17, 33, 74 and 90. However, the final Office Action cited column 8, lines 14-36 of Eber disclosing such features. The final Office Action then concluded that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have modified the system of Thakker in view of the teaching of Eber to arrive at the features of claims 10, 17, 33, 74 and 90.

Appellants disagree. The passage of Eber at column 8, lines 14-36 is reproduced below:

> By the provision of the control means **19** it is achieved in a simple manner that the transfer of the clock signal CLK to the data processing means **8** can be inhibited at least for the greater part upon detection of a pause interval P, as a result of which the power drain EE from the storage means **10** caused by the data processing means **8** is reduced significantly, as can be seen in FIG. **3**H, which diagrammatically represents the power drain EE from the storage means **10**. Upon the termination of a supply of power EZ to the storage means **10** at the instant T1 the data processing means **8**, as is apparent from FIG. **3**H, only drain power EE from the storage means **10** until the instant **T2** because the clock signal CLK is applied to the data processing means **8** only till the instant **T2** and the data processing means **8** consequently have a higher operating power consumption. Thus, power is drained from the storage means **10** only in the short time interval D**6**. There is no power drain EE from the storage means **10** by the data processing means **8** after the instant T**2** in the time interval D**7** until the instant T**7**, which is very advantageous because, as is apparent from FIG. **3**B, a supply of power EZ to the storage means is resumed already at the instant T**6** prior to the instant T**7**.
>
> FIG. **4** shows a data carrier **1** in a second embodiment of the invention, which differs from the data carrier shown in FIG. **1** with respect to the design of the logic means **20** of the control means **19**.

Again, exemplary claim 10 recites an interface circuit that interfaces with the WCD, the interface circuit including a clock input to the SIM , and wherein terminating power to the SIM includes terminating power after terminating a clock signal to the clock input. Nothing in the passage of Eber above appears to have any relevance to such features.

For this additional reason, the rejections of claims 10, 17, 33, 74 and 90 must be reversed.

FOURTH GROUND OF REJECTION UNDER APPEAL

(Claims 11-13, 27-29, 43-45, 84-86 and 100-102)

Claims 11-13, 27-29, 43-45, 84-86 and 100-102 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thakker in view of Barvesten (EP 0607767).

Claims 11-13, 27-29, 43-45, 84-86 and 100-102 are dependent upon claims 1, 17, 33, 74 and 90 respectively, and are patentable by virtue of the dependency upon claims 1, 17, 33, 74 and 90. In addition, claims 11-13, 27-29, 43-45, 84-86 and 100-102 are patentable for another reason. In particular, contrary to conclusions advanced in the final Office Action, Barvesten does not appear to disclose or suggest any security authorization process that authorizes the use of *secure features* of the SIM, as required by claims 11-13, 27-29, 43-45, 84-86 and 100-102.

While Barvesten may disclose a security authorization process for accessing a SIM itself, the entire concept of *secure features* of the SIM is lacking from Barvesten. For this additional reason, the rejections of claims 11-13, 27-29, 43-45, 84-86 and 100-102 should be reversed.

Appellants do not acquiesce to any of the interpretations of Barvesten advanced in the final Office Action, but respectively submit that for purposes of this Appeal, claims 11-13, 27-29, 43-45, 84-86 and 100-102 stand or fall together.

FIFTH GROUND OF REJECTION UNDER APPEAL

(Claims 14, 15, 30, 31, 46, 47, 87, 88, 103 and 104)

Claims 14, 15, 30, 31, 46, 47, 87, 88, 103 and 104 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thakker and Barvesten in view of Timonen.

Claims 14 and 15, 30 and 31, 46 and 47, 87 and 88, and 103 and 104 are dependent upon claims 1, 17, 33, 74 and 90 respectively, and are patentable by virtue of the dependency upon claims 1, 17, 33, 74 and 90. For purposes of this Appeal, claims 14, 15, 30, 31, 46, 47, 87, 88, 103 and 104 stand or fall with independent claims 1, 17, 33, 74 and 90. However, Appellants do not acquiesce to the conclusions or interpretations of the prior art references advanced in the final Office Action.

SIXTH GROUND OF REJECTION UNDER APPEAL

(Claims 49, 52, 53, 55-57, 60, 61, 63-65, 68, 69 and 71-73)

Claims 49, 52, 53, 55-57, 60, 61, 63-65, 68, 69 and 71-73 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thakker in view of Barvesten. Claims 49, 52, 53, 55-57, 60, 61, 63-65, 68, 69 and 71-73 are patentable for the same reasons that claims 1, 17, 33, 74 and 90 are patentable. Namely, as outlined in detail above, the Thakker reference fails to disclose or suggest supplying power to the SIM when a request is pending for service by the SIM, supplying power to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM, and terminating power to the SIM when no request is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM.

In addition, claims 49, 52, 53, 55-57, 60, 61, 63-65, 68, 69 and 71-73 are patentable for another reason.

Independent claim 49 recites a method comprising storing a user access code associated with a SIM in a memory associated with a WCD in response to a user entering the access code at an initial power up of the WCD, retrieving the user access code from the memory when power is resupplied to the SIM, using the retrieved user access code in a security authorization process in the WCD to authorize use of secure features of the SIM, terminating power to the SIM when no request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM, terminating power to the SIM when power to the WCD is terminated, retrieving and using the user access code when power is resupplied to the SIM following termination of power to the SIM when no request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM, and accepting and using user input as the user access code when power is resupplied to the SIM following termination when power to the WCD is terminated. Independent claims 57 and 65 recite similar features to those of claim 49.

For purposes of this Appeal, dependent claims 52, 53, 55, 56, 60, 61, 63, 64, 68, 69 and 71-73 stand or fall with the respective independent claims.

In rejecting independent claims 47, 57 and 65, the final Office Action concluded that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found a rational reason to modify the teaching of Thakker in view of Barvesten to arrive at the features of claims 47, 57 and 65. This conclusion is incorrect for several reasons.

First, as outlined above with respect to independent claims 1, 17, 33, 74 and 90, the Thakker reference fails to disclose or suggest supplying power to the SIM when a request is pending for service by the SIM, supplying power to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM, and terminating power to the SIM when no request is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM.

Second, as outlined above with respect to claims 11-13, 27-29, 43-45, 84-86 and 100-102, Barvesten does not appear to disclose or suggest any security authorization process that authorizes the use of *secure features* of the SIM. While Barvesten may disclose a security authorization process for accessing a SIM, the entire concept of *secure features* of the SIM is lacking from Barvesten.

Third, claims 49, 52, 53, 55-57, 60, 61, 63-65, 68, 69 and 71-73 even further clarify the fact that these claims concern power management of a SIM within a WCD, and the fact that power management of a SIM in a WCD is different than security management of a WCD.

For example, independent claims 47, 57 and 65 specifically recite retrieving and using the user access code when power is resupplied to the SIM following termination of power to the SIM when no request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM, and accepting and using user input as the user access code when power is resupplied to the SIM following termination when power to the WCD is terminated. Thus, these claims recite different contingencies for the user access code based on whether power is resupplied to the SIM following termination of power to the SIM, or whether power is resupplied to the SIM following termination when power to the WCD is terminated. In this way, these features further clarify the fact that claims 47, 57 and 65 concern power management of a SIM, and the fact that power management of a SIM is different than power management of a WCD. In this case, claims 47, 57 and 65 recite different contingencies for the user access code based on whether power was terminated to the SIM in the WCD, or to the WCD itself.

Nothing in the either Thakker or Barvesten, either alone or in combination, discloses or suggests these features. For this reason, the rejections of claims 49, 52, 53, 55-57, 60, 61, 63-65, 68, 69 and 71-73 should be reversed.

SEVENTH GROUND OF REJECTION UNDER APPEAL

(Claims 54, 62 and 70)

Claims 54, 62 and 70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thakker and Barvesten in view of Timonen. For purposes of this Appeal, claims 54, 62 and 70 stand or fall with independent claims 47, 57 and 65.

CONCLUSION OF ARGUMENT

Appellants respectfully request review of the rejections addressed above, and reversal of all pending rejections.

Appellants respectfully request separate review by the Board for each of the grounds or rejection addressed above under separate headings.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Oct. 19, 2007

By: /Eric Ho/

QUALCOMM, Inc.
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (858) 651-1306
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502

Name: Eric Ho
Reg. No.: 39,711

CLAIMS APPENDIX:

Claim 1 (Previously Presented): A method for managing power to a subscriber identity module (SIM) in a wireless communication device (WCD) when power is supplied to the WCD during operation of the WCD, the method comprising:

supplying power to the SIM when a request is pending for service by the SIM;

supplying power to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM; and

terminating power to the SIM when no request is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM.

Claim 2 (Original): The method of claim 1, further comprising re-initiating supply of power to the SIM following termination of power to the SIM when a request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM.

Claim 3 (Previously presented): The method of claim 1, further comprising determining whether a request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM based on inspection of a request queue associated with the SIM.

Claim 4 (Original): The method of claim 1, further comprising re-initiating supply of power to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM.

Claim 5 (Previously presented): The method of claim 4, further comprising determining whether a software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM based on polling of any of a plurality of software modules running on the WCD.

Claim 6 (Previously presented): The method of claim 4, further comprising:

asserting respective bits in a data structure when corresponding software modules running on the WCD request supply of power to the SIM;

determining whether a software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM based on analysis of the data structure; and

when any of the bits in the data structure is asserted, supplying power to the SIM.

Claim 7 (Original): The method of claim 1, wherein supplying power to the SIM includes maintaining power to the SIM.

Claim 8 (Original): The method of claim 1, wherein the SIM includes an interface circuit that interfaces with the WCD, and terminating power to the SIM includes terminating power to the interface circuit.

Claim 9 (Original): The method of claim 1, wherein the SIM includes a power supply line coupled to the WCD, and terminating power to the SIM includes terminating power to the power supply line.

Claim 10 (Previously Presented): The method of claim 1, wherein the SIM includes an interface circuit that interfaces with the WCD, the interface circuit including a clock input to the SIM , and wherein terminating power to the SIM includes terminating power after terminating a clock signal to the clock input.

Claim 11 (Previously Presented): The method of claim 1, further comprising:

storing a user access code associated with the SIM in a memory associated with the WCD in response to a user entering the access code at an initial power up of the WCD;

retrieving the user access code from the memory when power is supplied to the SIM following the termination of power to the SIM; and

using the retrieved user access code in a security authorization process in the WCD to authorize use of secure features of the SIM.

Claim 12 (Original): The method of claim 11, wherein storing the user access code includes storing the user access code upon the termination of power to the SIM.

Claim 13 (Original): The method of claim 11, wherein the SIM is one of a removable user identification module (R-UIM) and a GSM SIM, and the user access code is a card holder verification (CHV) code.

Claim 14 (Original): The method of claim 11, wherein the SIM is a universal subscriber identification module (USIM), and the user access code is a personal identification number (PIN).

Claim 15 (Original): The method of claim 1, wherein the SIM is one of a removable user identification module (R-UIM), a GSM SIM, and a universal subscriber identification module (USIM).

Claim 16 (Original): The method of claim 1, wherein the WCD is one of a cellular radiotelephone, a satellite radiotelephone, a PCMCIA card, and a PDA that communicates according to one of the CDMA standard, the GSM standard, and the WCDMA standard.

Claim 17 (Previously Presented): A system for managing power to a subscriber identity module (SIM) in a wireless communication device (WCD) when power is supplied to the WCD during operation of the WCD, the system comprising:

a power source coupled to the SIM; and

a processor that controls the power source to:

(a) supply power from the power source to the SIM when a request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM,

(b) supply power from the power source to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM, and

(c) terminate power to the SIM when no request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM.

Claim 18 (Original): The system of claim 17, wherein the processor controls the power source to re-initiate supply of power to the SIM following termination of power to the SIM when a request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM.

Claim 19 (Previously presented): The system of claim 17, wherein the processor determines whether a request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM based on inspection of a request queue associated with the SIM.

Claim 20 (Original): The system of claim 17, wherein the processor controls the power source to re-initiate supply of power to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM.

Claim 21 (Previously presented): The system of claim 20, wherein the processor determines whether a software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM based on polling of any of a plurality of software modules running on the WCD.

Claim 22 (Previously presented): The system of claim 20, further comprising a memory storing a data structure with bits corresponding to software modules running on the WCD, wherein the processor asserts respective bits in the data structure when corresponding software modules running on the WCD request supply of power to the SIM, determines whether a software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM based on analysis of the data structure, and, when any of the bits in the data structure is asserted, controls the power source to supply power to the SIM.

Claim 23 (Original): The system of claim 17, wherein the processor controls the power source to maintain power to the SIM.

Claim 24 (Original): The system of claim 17, wherein the SIM includes an interface circuit that interfaces with the WCD, and the processor controls the power source to terminate power to the SIM by terminating power to the interface circuit.

Claim 25 (Original): The system of claim 17, wherein the SIM includes a power supply line coupled to the WCD, and the processor controls the power source to terminate power to the SIM by terminating power to the power supply line.

Claim 26 (Previously Presented): The system of claim 17, wherein the SIM includes an interface circuit that interfaces with the WCD, the interface circuit including a clock input to the SIM, and wherein the processor controls the power source to terminate power to the SIM by terminating power after terminating a clock signal to the clock input.

Claim 27 (Previously Presented): The system of claim 17, further comprising a memory associated with the WCD that stores a user access code associated with the SIM in response to a user entering the access code at an initial power up of the WCD, wherein the processor retrieves the user access code from the memory when power is supplied to the SIM following the termination of power to the SIM, and uses the retrieved user

access code in a security authorization process in the WCD to authorize use of the secure features SIM.

Claim 28 (Original): The system of claim 27, wherein the processor stores the user access code upon the termination of power to the SIM.

Claim 29 (Original): The system of claim 27, wherein the SIM is one of a removable user identification module (R-UIM) and a GSM SIM, and the user access code is a card holder verification (CHV) code.

Claim 30 (Original): The system of claim 27, wherein the SIM is a universal subscriber identification module (USIM), and the user access code is a personal identification number (PIN).

Claim 31 (Original): The system of claim 17, wherein the SIM is one of a removable user identification module (R-UIM), a GSM SIM, and a universal subscriber identification module (USIM).

Claim 32 (Original): The system of claim 17, wherein the WCD is one of a cellular radiotelephone, a satellite radiotelephone, a PCMCIA card, and a PDA that communicates according to one of the CDMA standard, the GSM standard, and the WCDMA standard.

Claim 33 (Previously Presented): A computer-readable medium containing instructions that cause a programmable processor to manage power to a subscriber identity module (SIM) of a wireless communication device (WCD) when power is supplied to the WCD during operation of the WCD:

supply power to the SIM when a request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM;

supply power to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM; and

terminate power to the SIM when no request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM.

Claim 34 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 33, wherein the instructions cause the processor to re-initiate supply of power to the SIM following termination of power to the SIM when a request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM.

Claim 35 (Previously presented): The computer-readable medium of claim 33, wherein the instructions cause the processor to determine whether a request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM based on inspection of a request queue associated with the SIM.

Claim 36 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 33, wherein the instructions cause the processor to re-initiate supply of power to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM.

Claim 37 (Previously presented): The computer-readable medium of claim 36, wherein the instructions cause the processor to determine whether a software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM based on polling of any of a plurality of software modules running on the WCD.

Claim 38 (Previously presented): The computer-readable medium of claim 36, wherein the instructions cause the processor to:

define a data structure with bits corresponding to software modules running on the WCD;

assert respective bits in the data structure when corresponding software modules running on the WCD request supply of power to the SIM;

determine whether a software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM based on analysis of the data structure; and

when any of the bits in the data structure is asserted, supply power to the SIM.

Claim 39 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 37, wherein the instructions cause the processor to supply power to the SIM by maintaining power to the SIM.

Claim 40 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 33, wherein the SIM includes an interface circuit that interfaces with the WCD, and the instructions cause the processor to terminate power to the SIM by terminating power to the interface circuit.

Claim 41 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 33, wherein the SIM includes a power supply line coupled to the WCD, and the instructions cause the processor to terminate power to the SIM by terminating power to the power supply line.

Claim 42 (Previously Presented): The computer-readable medium of claim 33, wherein the SIM includes an interface circuit that interfaces with the WCD, the interface circuit including a clock input to the SIM , and the instructions cause the processor to terminate power to the SIM by terminating power after terminating a clock signal to the clock input.

Claim 43 (Previously Presented): The computer-readable medium of claim 33, wherein the instructions cause the processor to:

store a user access code associated with the SIM in a memory associated with the WCD in response to a user entering the access code at an initial power up of the WCD;

retrieve the user access code from the memory when power is supplied to the SIM following the termination of power to the SIM; and

use the retrieved user access code in a security authorization process in the WCD to authorize use of the WCD.

Claim 44 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 43, wherein the instructions cause the processor to store the user access code upon the termination of power to the SIM.

Claim 45 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 43, wherein the SIM is one of a removable user identification module (R-UIM) and a GSM SIM, and the user access code is a card holder verification (CHV) code.

Claim 46 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 43, wherein the SIM is a universal subscriber identification module (USIM), and the user access code is a personal identification number (PIN).

Claim 47 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 33, wherein the SIM is one of a removable user identification module (R-UIM), a GSM SIM, and a universal subscriber identification module (USIM).

Claim 48 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 33, wherein the WCD is one of a cellular radiotelephone, a satellite radiotelephone, a PCMCIA card, and a PDA that communicates according to one of the CDMA standard, the GSM standard, and the WCDMA standard.

Claim 49 (Previously Presented): A method comprising:

storing a user access code associated with a subscriber identity module (SIM) in a memory associated with a wireless communication device (WCD) in response to a user entering the access code at an initial power up of the WCD;

retrieving the user access code from the memory when power is resupplied to the SIM;

using the retrieved user access code in a security authorization process in the WCD to authorize use of secure features of the SIM;

terminating power to the SIM when no request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM;

terminating power to the SIM when power to the WCD is terminated

retrieving and using the user access code when power is resupplied to the SIM following termination of power to the SIM when no request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM; and

accepting and using user input as the user access code when power is resupplied to the SIM following termination when power to the WCD is terminated.

Claim 50-51 (Cancelled).

Claim 52 (Original): The method of claim 49, wherein storing the user access code includes storing the user access code when power to the SIM is terminated.

Claim 53 (Original): The method of claim 49, wherein the SIM is one of a removable user identification module (R-UIM) and a GSM SIM, and the user access code is a card holder verification (CHV) code.

Claim 54 (Original): The method of claim 49, wherein the SIM is a universal subscriber identification module (USIM), and the user access code is a personal identification number (PIN).

Claim 55 (Original): The method of claim 49, wherein the SIM is one of a removable user identification module (R-UIM), a GSM SIM, and a universal subscriber identification module (USIM).

Claim 56 (Original): The method of claim 49, wherein the WCD is one of a cellular radiotelephone, a satellite radiotelephone, a PCMCIA card, and a PDA that communicates according to one of the CDMA standard, the GSM standard, and the WCDMA standard.

Claim 57 (Previously Presented): A system comprising:

a memory that stores a user access code associated with a subscriber identity module (SIM) in a memory associated with a wireless communication device (WCD) in response to a user entering the access code at an initial power up of the WCD; and

a processor that retrieves the user access code from the memory when power is resupplied to the SIM, uses the retrieved user access code in a security authorization process in the WCD to authorize use of the WCD, terminates power to the SIM when no request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM, terminates power to the SIM when power to the WCD is terminated, retrieves and uses the user access code when power is resupplied to the SIM following termination of power to the SIM when no request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM, and accepts and uses user input as the user access code when power is resupplied to the SIM following termination of power to the SIM when power to the WCD is terminated.

Claims 58-59 (Cancelled).

Claim 60 (Original): The system of claim 57, wherein the processor stores the user access code in the memory when power to the SIM is terminated.

Claim 61 (Original): The system of claim 57, wherein the SIM is one of a removable user identification module (R-UIM) and a GSM SIM, and the user access code is a card holder verification (CHV) code.

Claim 62 (Original): The system of claim 57, wherein the SIM is a universal subscriber identification module (USIM), and the user access code is a personal identification number (PIN).

Claim 63 (Original): The system of claim 57, wherein the SIM is one of a removable user identification module (R-UIM), a GSM SIM, and a universal subscriber identification module (USIM).

Claim 64 (Original): The system of claim 57, wherein the WCD is one of a cellular radiotelephone, a satellite radiotelephone, a PCMCIA card, and a PDA that communicates according to one of the CDMA standard, the GSM standard, and the WCDMA standard.

Claim 65 (Previously Presented): A computer-readable medium containing instructions that cause a processor to:

store a user access code associated with a SIM in a memory associated with a wireless communication device (WCD) in response to a user entering the access code at an initial power up of the WCD;

retrieve the user access code from the memory when power is resupplied to the SIM;

use the retrieved user access code in a security authorization process in the WCD to authorize use of the WCD;

terminate power to the SIM when no request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM;

terminate power to the SIM when power to the WCD is terminated;

retrieve and use the user access code when power is resupplied to the SIM following termination of power to the SIM when no request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM; and

accept and use user input as the user access code when power is resupplied to the SIM following termination of power to the SIM when power to the WCD is terminated.

Claims 66-67 (Cancelled).

Claim 68 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 65, wherein the instructions cause the processor to store the user access code when power to the SIM is terminated.

Claim 69 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 65, wherein the SIM is one of a removable user identification module (R-UIM) and a GSM SIM, and the user access code is a card holder verification (CHV) code.

Claim 70 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 65, wherein the SIM is a universal subscriber identification module (USIM), and the user access code is a personal identification number (PIN).

Claim 71 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 65, wherein the SIM is one of a removable user identification module (R-UIM), a GSM SIM, and a universal subscriber identification module (USIM).

Claim 72 (Original): The computer-readable medium of claim 65, wherein the WCD is one of a cellular radiotelephone, a satellite radiotelephone, a PCMCIA card, and a PDA that communicates according to one of the CDMA standard, the GSM standard, and the WCDMA standard.

Claim 73 (Previously Presented): The computer-readable medium of claim 65, wherein the user access code enables access to secure features of the SIM.

Claim 74 (Previously presented): A wireless communication device (WCD) capable of receiving a subscriber identity module (SIM), wherein the WCD manages power to the SIM when power is supplied to the WCD during operation of the WCD, the WCD comprising:

means for supplying power to the SIM when a request is pending for service by the SIM;

means for supplying power to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM; and

means for terminating power to the SIM when no request is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM.

Claim 75 (Previously presented): The WCD of claim 74, further comprising means for re-initiating supply of power to the SIM following termination of power to the SIM when a request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM.

Claim 76 (Previously presented): The WCD of claim 74, further comprising means for determining whether a request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM based on inspection of a request queue associated with the SIM.

Claim 77 (Previously presented): The WCD of claim 74, further comprising means for re-initiating supply of power to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM.

Claim 78 (Previously presented): The WCD of claim 77, further comprising means for determining whether a software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM based on polling of any of a plurality of software modules running on the WCD.

Claim 79 (Previously presented): The WCD of claim 77, further comprising:

means for asserting respective bits in a data structure when corresponding software modules running on the WCD request supply of power to the SIM;

means for determining whether a software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM based on analysis of the data structure; and

means for supplying power to the SIM when any of the bits in the data structure is asserted.

Claim 80 (Previously presented): The WCD of claim 74, wherein the means for supplying power to the SIM includes means for maintaining power to the SIM.

Claim 81 (Previously presented): The WCD of claim 74, wherein the SIM, which can be received by the WCD, includes an interface circuit that interfaces with the WCD, and wherein the means for terminating power to the SIM includes means for terminating power to the interface circuit.

Claim 82 (Previously presented): The WCD of claim 74, wherein the SIM, which can be received by the WCD, includes a power supply line coupled to the WCD, and the means for terminating power to the SIM includes means for terminating power to the power supply line.

Claim 83 (Previously presented): The WCD of claim 74, wherein the SIM, which can be received by the WCD, includes an interface circuit that interfaces with the WCD, the interface circuit including a clock input to the SIM , and wherein means for terminating power to the SIM includes means for terminating power after terminating a clock signal to the clock input.

Claim 84 (Previously presented): The WCD of claim 74, further comprising:

means for storing a user access code associated with the SIM in a memory associated with the WCD in response to a user entering the access code at an initial power up of the WCD;

means for retrieving the user access code from the memory when power is supplied to the SIM following the termination of power to the SIM; and

means for using the retrieved user access code in a security authorization process in the WCD to authorize use of secure features of the SIM.

Claim 85 (Previously presented): The WCD of claim 84, wherein the means for storing the user access code stores the user access code upon the termination of power to the SIM.

Claim 86 (Previously presented): The WCD of claim 84, wherein the SIM that can be received by the WCD is one of a removable user identification module (R-UIM) and a GSM SIM, and the user access code is a card holder verification (CHV) code.

Claim 87 (Previously presented): The WCD of claim 84, wherein the SIM that can be received by the WCD is a universal subscriber identification module (USIM), and the user access code is a personal identification number (PIN).

Claim 88 (Previously presented): The WCD of claim 74, wherein the SIM that can be received by the WCD is one of a removable user identification module (R-UIM), a GSM SIM, and a universal subscriber identification module (USIM).

Claim 89 (Previously presented): The WCD of claim 74, wherein the WCD is one of a cellular radiotelephone, a satellite radiotelephone, a PCMCIA card, and a PDA that communicates according to one of the CDMA standard, the GSM standard, and the WCDMA standard.

Claim 90 (Previously presented): A wireless communication device (WCD) capable of receiving a subscriber identity module (SIM), wherein the WCD manages power to the SIM when power is supplied to the WCD during operation of the WCD, the WCD comprising:

a power source capable of being coupled to the SIM; and

a processor that controls the power source to:

(a) supply power from the power source to the SIM when a request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM,

(b) supply power from the power source to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD requests maintenance of power to the SIM, and

(c) terminate power to the SIM when no request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM and no software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM.

Claim 91 (Previously presented): The WCD of claim 90, wherein the processor controls the power source to re-initiate supply of power to the SIM following termination of power to the SIM when a request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM.

Claim 92 (Previously presented): The WCD of claim 90, wherein the processor determines whether a request from the WCD is pending for service by the SIM based on inspection of a request queue associated with the SIM.

Claim 93 (Previously presented): The WCD of claim 90, wherein the processor controls the power source to re-initiate supply of power to the SIM when a software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM.

Claim 94 (Previously presented): The WCD of claim 93, wherein the processor determines whether a software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM based on polling of any of a plurality of software modules running on the WCD.

Claim 95 (Previously presented): The WCD of claim 93, further comprising a memory storing a data structure with bits corresponding to software modules running on the WCD, wherein the processor asserts respective bits in the data structure when corresponding software modules running on the WCD request supply of power to the SIM, determines whether a software module running on the WCD requests supply of power to the SIM based on analysis of the data structure and, when any of the bits in the data structure is asserted, controls the power source to supply power to the SIM.

Claim 96 (Previously presented): The WCD of claim 90, wherein the processor controls the power source to maintain power to the SIM.

Claim 97 (Previously presented): The WCD of claim 90, wherein the SIM, which can be received by the WCD, includes an interface circuit that interfaces with the WCD, and the processor controls the power source to terminate power to the SIM by terminating power to the interface circuit.

Claim 98 (Previously presented): The WCD of claim 90, wherein the SIM, which can be received by the WCD, includes a power supply line coupled to the WCD, and the processor controls the power source to terminate power to the SIM by terminating power to the power supply line.

Claim 99 (Previously presented): The WCD of claim 90, wherein the SIM, which can be received by the WCD, includes an interface circuit that interfaces with the WCD, the interface circuit including a clock input to the SIM, and wherein the processor controls the power source to terminate power to the SIM by terminating power after terminating a clock signal to the clock input.

Claim 100 (Previously presented): The WCD of claim 90, further comprising a memory that stores a user access code associated with the SIM in response to a user entering the access code at an initial power up of the WCD, wherein the processor retrieves the user access code from the memory when power is supplied to the SIM following the termination of power to the SIM, and uses the retrieved user access code in a security authorization process in the WCD to authorize use of the secure features SIM.

Claim 101 (Previously presented): The WCD of claim 100, wherein the processor stores the user access code upon the termination of power to the SIM.

Claim 102 (Previously presented): The WCD of claim 100, wherein the SIM, which can be received by the WCD, is one of a removable user identification module (R-UIM) and a GSM SIM, and the user access code is a card holder verification (CHV) code.

Claim 103 (Previously presented): The WCD of claim 100, wherein the SIM, which can be received by the WCD, is a universal subscriber identification module (USIM), and the user access code is a personal identification number (PIN).

Claim 104 (Previously presented): The WCD of claim 90, wherein the SIM, which can be received by the WCD, is one of a removable user identification module (R-UIM), a GSM SIM, and a universal subscriber identification module (USIM).

Claim 105 (Previously presented): The WCD of claim 90, wherein the WCD is one of a cellular radiotelephone, a satellite radiotelephone, a PCMCIA card, and a PDA that communicates according to one of the CDMA standard, the GSM standard, and the WCDMA standard.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX:

NONE

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX:

NONE